

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**CHARLESTON DIVISION**

CHRISTOPHER B.,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:24-cv-00094

MICHELLE A. KING,

*Commissioner for the Social Security Administration,*

Defendant.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

Before the Court is Christopher Browning’s (“Claimant”) Complaint seeking review of the decision of the Acting Commissioner of Social Security, Michelle A. King<sup>1</sup> (“Commissioner”). (ECF No. 2.) By Standing Order, this action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Joseph K. Reeder for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation (“PF&R”). (ECF No. 3.) Magistrate Judge Reeder filed his PF&R on November 19, 2024, (ECF No. 10), recommending that this Court deny the Claimant’s motion for judgment on the pleadings, (ECF No. 6), grant the Defendant’s motion for judgment on the pleadings, (ECF No. 7), affirm the final decision of the Commissioner, and dismiss this action from the court’s docket.

The Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation

---

<sup>1</sup> This action was initially brought against Martin J. O’Malley, who was the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration when Claimant first filed for review on February 27, 2024. Commissioner King became the substituted party to this action on January 20, 2025.

to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner's right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). In addition, this Court need not conduct a de novo review when a party "makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations." *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Objections to the PF&R were due on December 3, 2024. To date, no objections have been filed.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R (ECF No. 10), **DENIES** Claimant's motion for judgment on the pleadings, (ECF No. 6), **GRANTS** Defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings, (ECF No. 7), and **AFFIRMS** the final decision of the Commissioner, **DISMISSES** this action from the Court's docket.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a copy of this Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: February 4, 2025

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
THOMAS E. JOHNSTON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE